



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 10/755,888 | 01/13/2004 | William Bornstein | AUS920030988US1(4031) | 1544 |
| 45557 | 7590 | 04/21/2008 | EXAMINER | |
| IBM CORPORATION (JSS) C/O SCHUBERT OSTERRIEDER & NICKELSON PLLC 6013 CANNON MOUNTAIN DRIVE, S14 AUSTIN, TX 78749 | | | BAYAT, ALI | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | | |
| | 2624 | | | |
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | | | |
| 04/21/2008 | PAPER | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/755,888 | Applicant(s) BORNSTEIN ET AL. |
| | Examiner ALI BAYAT | Art Unit 2624 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ali Bayat. (3) _____.

(2) Neil Cohen Reg. # 54041. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 April 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Claims 1 and 22 and 4.

Identification of prior art discussed: Gruhlke et al. and Suzuki et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative discussed the independent claims 1 and 22. Further explained that, Gruhlke does not provide for moving the array to position another sensing element and reflective mirror. Examiner suggested that by amending the above claims and disclosing the difference between the cited arts and the applicant's invention, to overcome the cited arts.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Matthew C. Bella/SPE

Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.